



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/911,256 | 07/23/2001 | Patrick J. McLampy | 050115-1060 | 4811 |
| 24504 | 7590 | 01/08/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP | | | CHO, HONG SOL | |
| 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| STE 1750 | | | | |
| ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948 | | | 2616 | |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 01/08/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/911,256 | MELAMPY ET AL. |
| | Examiner Hong Cho | Art Unit 2616 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 41,43,45,47,48,50,52,54,55,57,59 and 61-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 41,43,47,48,50,54,55,57 and 61 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 45, 52, 59 and 62-64 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the RCE filed on 11/9/2006. Claims 1-40, 42, 44, 46, 49, 51, 53, 56, 58, and 60 were canceled. Claims 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, 50, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, and 61-64 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 41, 43, 47, 48, 50, 54, 55, 57 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grabelsky et al (US 6678250), hereinafter referred to as Grabelsky, in view of Hurme et al (US 5898697), hereinafter referred to as Hurme.

Re claims 41, 48, and 55, Grabelsky discloses measuring delay for a real time transport protocol (RTP) between edge devices (figure 1, elements 20-23, *between a first and second endpoint*) through IP network (*determining latency for RTP data flow between a first endpoint and a second endpoint*, figure 1; column 2, lines 27-38). Grabelsky discloses a edge device transmitting and receiving reports through an Internet

Protocol (IP) network where router are inherently existed to route IP packets (*RTP data flow transiting through a media router*, column 4, lines 12-17). Grabelsky discloses a source gateway directing the RTP packets onto the IP network that transports the RTP packets to the destination gateway, receiving sender reports or receiver reports from each other session members periodically (*intercepting a first RTCP sender report from the first endpoint and a first RTCP receiver report from the second endpoint, each first report transiting through the media router, intercepting a second RTCP sender report from the second endpoint and a second RTCP receiver report from the first endpoint*, column 6, lines 6-17). Grabelsky discloses measuring a round-trip delay between edge devices by adjusting transmission interval between successive RTCP packets (*determining a round-trip delay between the first endpoint and the second endpoint based on a plurality of interception times, each interception time corresponding to the time of intercepting one of the RTCP reports*, column 8, lines 7-23; column 9, lines 61-65). Grabelsky fails to disclose a media router measuring a round-trip delay. Hurme discloses a device at the midpoint of the network measuring delay (column 1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify an arrangement for determining transmission delay so that a round-trip delay would be measured at the midpoint of the network as suggested by Hurme. The motivation is to have a centralized and dedicated network-monitoring device to reduce processing loads at edge devices.

Re claims 43, 50, and 57, Grabelsky discloses a source gateway (*the first endpoint*, figure 1, element 20) directing the RTP packets (*the first RTCP sender report*)

Art Unit: 2616

onto the IP network (figure 1, element 30, *through the media router*) that transports the RTP packets to the destination gateway (*the second endpoint*, figure 1, element 23) (*receiving, in the media router, the first RTCP sender report, the first sender report originating from the first endpoint and destined for the second endpoint and transiting through the media router, and transmitting the first RTCP sender report to the second endpoint*, column 4, lines 60-66).

Re claims 47, 54, and 61, Grabelsky discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose measuring a one-way latency between the first endpoint and the second endpoint by dividing the round-trip delay in half. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Grabelsky to determine one-way latency by dividing the round trip delay in half since Grabelsky suggests utilizing other network performance parameters (column 13, lines 4-16). The motivation is to achieve an overall view of network performance by getting snapshot of the packet delivery performance between a pair of host devices.

Re claim 55, Grabelsky inherently discloses a transceiver, memory, and a processor for necessarily enabling an edge device to receive and transmit reports and compute network statistics.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 45, 52, 59 and 62-64 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement for reasons for allowance.

5. Claim 45, 52 and 59 are allowable over the prior art of record since the cited references taken individually or in combination fail to particularly teach or fairly suggest recording a last session report (LSR) timestamp when the first RTCP sender report transits through the media router, marking a first timestamp in the media router when the first RTCP receiver report transmits though the media obtaining a delay since LSR (DLSR) representing processing delay in the second call endpoint and determining the round-trip delay based upon the LSR timestamp, the DLSR, and the first timestamp.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 41, 48 and 55 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Seema S. Rao
SEEMA S. RAO 1/4/07
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

hc
Hong Cho
Patent Examiner
12/28/2006